DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 267 HE 018 333

AUTHOR	Tom, Alice K.
TITLE	Individualized Study Program. Interim Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Davis. Office of Student Affairs Research and Information.
PUB DATE	Jan 83
NOTE	25p.; For related documents, see HE 018 336 and HE 018 343.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Academic Persistence; Basic Skills; Comparative Analysis; *Developmental Studies Programs; *Disadvantaged; Ethnic Groups; Full Time Students; *Grade Point Average; Higher Education; *High Risk Students; *Individualized Instruction; Minority Groups; Nontraditional Students; Open Enrollment; Part Time Students; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Remedial Programs; Selective Admission; State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Course Load; *University of California Davis

ABSTRACT

Results of an evaluation of the Individualized Study Program (ISP), a 2-year pilot program at the Learning Skills Center (LSC) of the University of California, Davis, are presented. The program target group were disadvantaged students who had not met the university's entrance requirements. The ISP, which is designed to improve retention of students with academic skill deficiencies, allows students to reduce their academic unit load, as long as they spent 9-12 hours per week improving basic skills through self-paced coursework, lab work, or intensive counselor assistance at the LSC. Some students maintained a full study load (12 units or more) with counselor assistance. After administering diagnostic reading, mathematics, and essays exams, an individualized study plan is developed. For students who choose a reduced course load, the student's schedule is stated in the form of a contract, an example of which is appended. Data are included on the sex and ethnicity of ISP and comparison students; and grade point averages of ISP participants, nonparticipants, and other student groups. Appendices include a list of general offerings of ISP, and a program evaluation form. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED256267

INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT: INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Student Affairs Research and Information Office

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Alice K. Tom
Office of Student Affairs Research
and Information
January 1983

HE017333

INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT: INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	2
Measures of Program Impact	4
Results of Comparison Analyses and Telephone Survey	8
Conclusions	12
Program Response to Evaluation Findings	15

LIST OF TABLES

Tables:

1	Sex and Ethnicity of Comparison and ISP Groups	6
2	Group Membership by STEP Participation and Entrance Level	7
3	Group Membership and Entrance Level by Entering GPA	8
4	Number of Tutoring Sessions, Workshops, and Successfully Completed Remedial Math and English Courses by Group Membership	10
5	Cumulative UCD GPA and Academic Standing at the End of Three Quarters by Group Membership	11

APPENDICES

Appendices:

A	Sample Individualized Study Program Contract	18
B	Individualized Study Program: Description of Offerings	19
C	Survey Questionnaire of Individualized Study Program Participants	21

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this evaluation report is to provide an interim review of a two-year pilot program, the Individualized Study Program, coordinated by the UC Davis Learning Skills Center. The Individualized Study Program (ISP) was implemented during the 1981-82 academic year with the major objective of enhancing the retention of selected students who exhibited severe basic academic skills deficiencies.

Program description: For the 1981-82 academic year, students selected to participate in ISP were allowed to reduce their academic unit load to 8 or 9 units with the stipulation that 9 to 12 hours per week be spent improving basic skills through self-paced coursework, lab work or intensive counselor assistance at the Learning Skills Center (LSC). (The 9 to 12 hours per week are equivalent in time to a 3 or 4 unit laboratory course.) Although no academic or work load units were earned for work at LSC, program participants were considered full-time students and maintained their eligibility for financial aid and other campus services.

The target group of students for ISP participation were EOP students[1] entering in Fall 1981 as Special Action[2] students. These students were invited to participate in the Special Transitional Enrichment Program (STEP) prior to their enrollment to UC Davis.[3]

The objectives of STEP are (1) to assist underprepared students to strengthen their learning skills and study habits in areas where improvement is needed, (2) to enhance students' readiness to do University work by providing a week of orientation and three weeks of instruction prior to the fall quarter, and (3) to assist students' adjustment to UC Davis by providing living/learning experiences in residence halls and general orientation to campus life. Thus, ISP represents one of several academic year extensions of STEP in its objective to enhance students' readiness to do University work and strengthen their basic skills.

There were five program selection criteria for 1981-82 ISP participants.

---

1 The Educational Opportunity Program is designed to assist and provide opportunities in higher education for students from economically/educationally disadvantaged backgrounds.

2 The Special Action admission category includes students who have not met UC entrance requirements, but who have demonstrated academic potential.

3 For more information on STEP see: "Study of the 1978 Summer STEP." Suhr, Jeanne. Office of Student Affairs Research and Evaluation. October 1980. University of California, Davis.

Fall Quarter ISP:

a. students who participated in Summer STEP but whose diagnostic test scores and performance indicated a need for continued intensive assistance, and

b. students who were granted a waiver from Summer STEP participation.

Winter and Spring Quarters ISP:

a. students who participated in ISP for one or two quarters but whose diagnostic scores and performance indicated a need for continued intensive assistance,

b. Special Action/EOP students who had not previously participated in the pilot program but whose academic performance indicated a need for intensive assistance, and

c. other Special Action students who requested assistance.

In addition, there were two levels of ISP participation available to invited students. Formal ISP participants both reduced their study load (less than 12 units) and received intensive counselor assistance; informal ISP participants maintained a full study load (more than or equal to 12 units), but received intensive counselor assistance.

Participation in ISP was voluntary. Students meeting the selection criteria were contacted by the ISP coordinator, who reviewed with the student his/her past academic record and explained the requirements and advantages of the program. If needed, the student completed a reading exam, mathematics exam and essay exam to determine the level and area of basic skills development needed. Based on the results of these exams and the initial interview, an individualized study plan was developed for the student. If the student chose to be a formal ISP participant, the student's schedule was stated in the form of a contract and signed by the student, ISP coordinator and an EOP counselor. (See Appendix A for a sample contract.) The contract obligated the student to participate fully in ISP and to forfeit full-time student status if the contract was violated. (Violation is defined as less than a 90% attendance rate in scheduled basic skills/ISP coursework hours. Students were monitored throughout their ISP participation for attendance and progress in the program.) In some cases, students invited to be ISP participants chose to be informal participants and a contract was not formalized. These students received intensive counselor assistance but did not reduce their study load.

A variety of services and course offerings was available to the student in the development of his/her ISP schedule. (Appendix B lists the general offerings of ISP.) A typical program included a combination of attendance at appropriate ISP workshops throughout the quarter, self-paced skills development in the LSC Learning Laboratory, weekly appointments with a LSC counselor to work on areas of most difficulty, and periodic sessions with Counseling Center staff to discuss career goals and adjustment to campus life in general.

An early warning system for ISP and non-ISP participants was also developed as part of the ISP monitoring responsibility. Through the cooperation of the UC Davis Registrar's Office, academic performance records of students identified as potential ISP participants were collected immediately after the end of the quarter. These records were reviewed by the ISP coordinator; students in academic difficulty were contacted before classes began for the following quarter and invited to participate in ISP.

MEASURES OF PROGRAM IMPACT

The current study examines the following question: Did the reduced study load and intensive learning assistance affect student academic participation and performance? Because ISP was designed to provide intensive remedial assistance, the actual use of tutoring, workshops, and remedial courses are one measure of student involvement in and compliance with the program. Thus, two measures of program participation were: (1) total number of tutoring hours used throughout the student's first three quarters, (2) number of workshops attended*, and three measures of program impact were (1) number of successful (courses with grades of "C" or better or a passed "P" grade) remedial math courses taken, and (2) number of successful remedial English courses taken, and (3) student academic standing (i.e., probationary or good) at the end of the first three quarters enrolled.

In order to determine the program effect on student performance, two comparison groups of similar students were identified. The first comparison group contains EOP students who had been admitted by Special Action in the previous year, attended Summer 1980 STEP (or received a waiver), and had access to services and course offerings similar to those for ISP participants. The second comparison group included Fall 1981 Special Action/EOP students invited to participate in ISP, who declined program services. However, many of the students in this group did receive academic counseling from the ISP coordinator which resulted in major class rescheduling or study program changes.

Each comparison group brought with it advantages and disadvantages. The Fall 1981 non-ISP group, although "contaminated" because of the initial ISP contact, is comprised of ISP cohorts, a fact that controls for time of entry to the University and other time-related variables. The Fall 1980 group, on the other hand, had no access to ISP; thus, any significant differences between the Fall 1980 and ISP groups may be attributed in part to ISP. However, these comparison results are limited due to differences in entering characteristics between these two groups.

---

*Workshops must be defined for these comparisons. For the most part, ISP students attended special workshops designed for ISP participation which differed from LSC workshops. The difference was both in the pace of the material covered and the ratio of student-to-insructor. ISP workshops were smaller which allowed for a closer liaison between student and instructor, and slower in pace. However, workshop topics and focus on remedial assistance were the same for LSC and ISP programming.

Analysis of the program included comparisons among four groups: formal ISP participants, informal ISP participants, Fall 1980 comparison group, and the Fall 1981 non-ISP comparison group. The major differences between the comparison groups and the ISP groups were the reduced study load and the intensive ISP assistance. Specifically, these four groups received one of four different levels of program assistance: no assistance (Fall 1980 comparison group), limited counseling assistance (Fall 1981 non-ISP comparison group), intensive counseling assistance and workshop participation (ISP informal), and intensive counseling assistance, workshop participation and reduction in study load (ISP formal group).

Two statistical techniques (analysis of variance and chi-square test of homogeneity) were used in reviewing the comparison and program group data. The objectives of these analyses are to test whether differences between the groups are large enough to represent more than random fluctuations. If there are no differences in outcomes between the groups, or if the differences are very small (i.e., non-significant results), then there is no evidence that ISP affected student academic participation and performance. However, as the differences between the groups become larger and the results are statistically significant, then it may be reasonable to believe that the program did affect student academic participation and performance.

Table 1 shows the sex and ethnic composition of the four groups of students compared in the analysis.

TABLE 1

SEX AND ETHNICITY OF COMPARISON AND ISP GROUPS
(In percent of students in each group)

	FALL 1980 COMPARISON GROUP (n=139)	FALL 1981 NON-ISP GROUP (n=53)	INFORMAL ISP (n=24)	FORMAL ISP (n=36)
Sex				
Male	55	55	54	28
Female	45	45	46	72
Ethnicity				
American Indian	3	2	0	3
Black	34	57	46	28
Caucasian	14	8	0	22
Chicano	14	8	21	14
Asian	24	19	33	33
Other and Decline to state	11	6	0	0

Major ethnic groups for the formal and informal ISP participants were Black (35%), Asian (33%) and Chicano (17%); 62% were female. Of the Fall 1980 comparison group, the major ethnic groups were Black (34%), and Chicano and Caucasian (each 14%); 45% were female; for the Fall 1981 non-ISP group, the major ethnic group was Black (57%). There were significant differences in the number of male and female students in each group ($x^2=8.87$, $p<.05$) as well as among the major ethnic categories of Black, Caucasian, Asian, Chicano and "Other" ($x^2=22.0$, $p<.05$).

These differences may influence program outcome because of the known relationships between sex, ethnicity, and academic performance (females, Asians, and Whites attain slightly higher GPAs in college than do males and other ethnic groups). However, these general relationships may not hold among this group of high risk students. If they are influential, the bias introduced would be in favor of the formal ISP students because of high numbers of females, Whites and Asians in that group.

Table 2 details the distribution of STEP participants and entrance levels by group membership.

TABLE 2

GROUP MEMBERSHIP BY STEP PARTICIPATION AND ENTRANCE LEVEL
(In percent of students in each group)

GROUP	TOTAL n	SUMMER STEP		LEVEL AT ENTRY	
		COMPLETED	WAIVED	FRESHMAN	ADVANCED STANDING
FALL 1980 COMPARISON	139	66	34	68	32
FALL 1981 NON-ISP	53	79	21	60	40
INFORMAL ISP	24	71	29	70	29
FORMAL ISP	36	81	19	61	39

There were no significant differences among the groups with respect to completion or waiver of summer STEP ($x^2=4.90$, $p<.20$) or freshman or advanced standing status at entry ($x^2=3.99$, $p<.30$).

Table 3 shows the distributions of entering GPA by group membership.

TABLE 3

GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND ENTRANCE LEVEL BY ENTERING GPA
(In percent of students in each group)

ENTERING GPA	FALL 1980 COMPARISON GROUP		FALL 1981 NON-ISP GROUP		INFORMAL ISP		FORMAL ISP	
	High School (n=96)	Transfer (n=43)	High School (n=32)	Transfer (n=21)	High School (n=17)	Transfer (n=7)	High School (n=22)	Transfer (n=14)
3.6 - 4.0	1	2	0	14	0	0	0	0
3.3 - 3.59	4	30	3	5	12	0	0	7
3.0 - 3.29	28	23	16	5	18	14	14	15
2.6 - 2.99	38	19	34	5	35	14	27	21
2.4 - 2.59	12	21	13	38	23	29	18	21
2.0 - 2.39	15	5	28	9	12	0	36	0
below 2.0	3	0	6	5	0	29	5	0
MISSING				19		14		36
MEAN GPA	2.8	3.03	2.57	2.72	2.70	2.16	2.50	2.86

An analysis of variance test showed that there was no statistical difference among the groups with respect to entering GPA. However, the entering GPA of the Fall 1980 comparison group is slightly better than any of the other three groups. Because the analytic methods used in this study do not require matched characteristics or equivalent numbers in each group for comparison, the differences in group size and student characteristics should not inhibit the statistical results. However, the importance of the findings may be limited because of the group differences (e.g. sex, ethnicity, entering GPA, summer STEP participation and entering class level).

RESULTS OF THE COMPARISON ANALYSES AND TELEPHONE SURVEY

The results of the statistical analyses suggest that there is little difference in outcomes between the groups, except that the ISP participants attended more workshops. That is, the ISP intervention program (both formal and informal) did not statistically affect most measures of student academic participation or performance (as compared to the Fall 1980 comparison group or the Fall 1981 non-ISP group). Although there was no statistical differ-

ence among the groups in tutoring participation, it was apparent that ISP students used this service to a greater degree than either comparison groups.

These findings are not unexpected because full-time student status for formal ISP participants is dependent on the number of workshops in which these students are registered. For instance, a majority of the formal ISP students chose a reduction of only one or two units. But a reduction of even one unit required a three-hour commitment to LSC workshops, which can represent as many as three one-hour workshops a week; this requirement may account for the significant results. The other variables reviewed were tutoring, and successful completion of remedial math and English courses. There was no statistical difference within these variables.

Table 4 shows the distribution of the number of tutoring and workshop sessions each group of students attended during the academic year as well as the number of successfully completed remedial math and English courses.

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF TUTORING SESSIONS, WORKSHOPS, AND SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED REMEDIAL MATH AND ENGLISH COURSES BY GROUP MEMBERSHIP

NUMBER OF COURSES/SESSIONS	FALL 1980 Comparison Group (n=139)	FALL 1981 Non-ISP Group (n=53)	FORMAL ISP (n=36)	INFORMAL ISP (n=24)
Tutoring Sessions				
Percent attending	38	25	54	46
Mean number of sessions tutored (includes only students tutored)	8.9	8.9	9.4	12.0
Workshops				
Percent attending	19	31	100	87
Modal number of workshops (includes only students attending)	1	1	2	1
Successful Math Courses[1]				
(number of courses)	-------percent of students in each group------			
1	16	17	26	29
2	8	6	4	0
3	4	1	0	0
Successful English Courses[2]				
(number of courses)	-------percent of students in each group------			
1	39	26	17	29
2	5	2	6	12

[1] Includes remedial Math B, C, D, Pre 16a, Co-16a, Co-16b

[2] Includes English R and English A

An important outcome measure representing academic performance is student GPA. For purposes of this report, student academic standing (good standing=GPA $\geq$2.0 and probationary standing=GPA $\leq$1.99) was measured at the conclusion of the student's first three quarters. Based on academic standing at the end of three quarters, formal and informal ISP participants did not differ from the Fall 1980 or Fall 1981 non-ISP comparison groups nor did they differ from each other (x^2=2.96, $p<.70$). Table 5 lists the number of students by academic standing and third quarter GPA for each group.

TABLE 5

CUMULATIVE UCD GPA AND ACADEMIC STANDING AT
THE END OF THREE QUARTERS BY GROUP MEMBERSHIP
(In percent of students in each group)

UC GPA	FALL 1980 Comparison Group (n=139)	FALL 1981 Non-ISP Group (n=53)	FORMAL ISP (n=36)	INFORMAL ISP (n=24)
Good Standing				
3.6 - 4.0	1	4	0	0
3.3 - 3.59	5	4	3	4
3.0 - 3.29	2	4	3	4
2.6 - 2.99	16	30	8	8
2.4 - 2.59	6	7	19	0
2.0 - 2.39	29	13	17	33
Total Percent in Good Standing	59	62	50	50
Probationary Standing				
<1.99	41	38	50	50

In addition to these statistical analyses, a telephone survey was conducted to assess the ISP participants' reactions and perceptions of the program and student life at UC Davis. (See Appendix C for a copy of the questionnaire.) Of the 60 formal and informal students, 32 (53%) responded to the survey. Because the telephone survey was conducted at the end of the spring quarter, there was difficulty in locating current phone numbers for these students as well as contacting them before summer vacation. Of those students who were contacted and refused to participate, reasons included the lack of time or interest in answering the survey, and difficulty in understanding English sufficiently to answer a survey over the telephone.

The four most important personal goals of these students in attending college are: (1) to increase their knowledge and understanding in an academic field, (2) to formulate long-term career plans and/or goals, (3) to prepare for a career, and (4) to obtain a degree. Many of the respondents felt that through ISP, they had been able to accomplish some of their goals: "Making it through my first year"; "I'm doing good in college"; "I now have experience about college"; and "So far, my math skills [are] way up."

More interesting were the students' responses to questions regarding the effect the program had on them. Here are some of the most frequent comments.

"A life jacket to a drowning person."

"A lot, helped me with math, vocabulary and English weaknesses and writing skills."

"Helped me with classes--especially math, chem."

"Incentive, confidence."

"Very important to a person who has been out of school for a long time, it helped me get back in the swing of things."

"One-to-one tutoring really helped--did not feel stupid asking questions."

Students were asked what, if anything, they felt was lacking in ISP. Several students commented: "Nothing, taught a lot." There were some students who felt that the program should be broadened to include more than basic skills and should be available to all students.

During the survey, students discussed the problems they had encountered since coming to UC Davis. The following list describes the most frequent and frustrating problems.

"Very frustrated adjusting to UC system--one department doesn't know anything about anyone else (especially Financial Aid); Work-Study people who don't know much of what is going on and make you run around entire school."

"Problems meeting people, ISP helped: social life--nothing to do."

"Math was a nightmare."

"Endless problems with Financial Aid."

"Adjusting to college life and classes, how to approach professors."

"How hard it is."

"Study habits, speed of classes in the quarter system."

Students also noted the biggest problems they felt they had to resolve before coming to UC Davis. These problems included: "Adjustment to school with family life"; "Leaving home, being independent--adjusting"; "Worried about money problems, financial problems"; and "Whether I really wanted to be in college or not, confidence."

CONCLUSIONS

It seems apparent that the Individualized Study Program was successful in identifying and contacting potential ISP participants, and in providing

intensive basic skills development assistance. All ISP participants maintained a 90% attendance rate. Of particular importance was the development of the "early warning system." The system proved to be extremely useful in identifying quarterly academic problems with Special Action/EOP students before problems were compounded by further unsuccessful coursework. It is anticipated that, through the early warning system, the retention rate of these students may increase over time.

The effects of the program on student performance are less apparent. There are several data limitations to the current study that may have affected these evaluation results. The most inhibiting data limitation was the lack of better comparison groups. The characteristics unique to the Fall 1980 Special Action/EOP group may have been influential in the students' first year performance. For instance, the Fall 1980 entrants may have been more mature or motivated than the ISP group. Based on entering GPA, it is apparent that these students were better academically prepared than the ISP group. There was no comparable diagnostic test information available that could be used to refine the comparison groups. Although the Fall 1981 non-ISP group is a more comparable, it is possible their academic participation and performance was influenced by early ISP contact.

Another problem may be the short time parameter used in reviewing the effectiveness of the program. That is, the benefit of the intensive remedial work and/or reduced study load options may not be observed until the student's second year at UC Davis.

However, based on the short-run (first three quarters) outcome, the comparison between formal ISP and informal ISP students did not reveal any significant differences as a result of the reduced study load option. In addition, the comparisons between the ISP groups and the Fall 1980 and Fall 1981 non-ISP comparison groups did not show any difference in academic performance due to the reduced study load option and/or intensive learning assistance methodology.

The acknowledgement of these study limitations do not entirely explain the reasons why ISP showed so little impact on its participants. Perhaps an additional question to answer is whether it is the program or the student that is responsible for the lack of a more successful outcome. That is, the target population for ISP service has been identified as extremely high-risk students with sufficient basic skills deficiencies to endanger their performance at UC Davis. These students represent a mixture of different levels of educational development, backgrounds, basic skills problems, and different motivation and maturation levels. According to discussions with ISP staff, each entering class of freshmen and advanced standing students yields a different composition of motivation and academic basic skills ability. ISP participants who exhibit a higher level of motivation to succeed at college and/or have better, although insufficient basic skills, will probably benefit more from the ISP program than students with lower ambitions. For some ISP students, their first year performance was comparable to regular admit students, but a substantial number of ISP students did not fare as well.

Based on the results of this interim evaluation report, four recommendations can be advanced.

1. The program should continue through the second year with specific attention on the effect of the early warning system. What effect does the early warning system have as a preventative method to student drop-outs? Does the early warning system provide an avenue for ISP to contact students for academic counseling and assistance in a timely and efficient manner? How do students perceive the early warning system--how helpful is it to them? Can the early warning system be applied on a larger scale to all EOP students?

2. A better comparison group should be used in future evaluations. For instance, random assignment of high risk students to the program would help in the coordination of a better comparison group. This procedure would control for entering characteristics and result in a more suitable comparison group. In addition, application of standard pre- and post-tests would be useful in the isolation of ISP remedial course effectiveness.

3. The long-term effect of the program should be assessed. 1981-82 ISP students should be tracked during their second year at UCD.

4. Program reassessment of the target population is suggested. Students within the target population who are at less risk but with some basic skills problems may benefit more from the program. Although this program attempts to assist all remedial need levels of students, its success is largely dependent on the students' motivation to succeed at college. Thus, the success of the program in its first year may not be the most appropriate point to measure program impact. Selection of ISP participants and method of service delivery should be reviewed in the second year.

PROGRAM RESPONSE TO EVALUATION FINDINGS

December 20, 1982

TO: Alice Tom

FR: Virginia Martucci

RE: INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT:
INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM

Per your request, following are the program's responses to the referenced report:

A. Body of the Report

1. The ISP staff and I very much appreciate your efforts to unearth a viable comparison group for ISP participants; however, we believe that the Fall 1980 STEP students pose a substantial difficulty as a comparison group. Although the mean entering GPA's between that group and all others were not significantly higher, the GPA distribution within each group was quite different, with 71% of the Fall 1980 freshmen entering with at least a 2.60 GPA compared to only 65% of the informal ISP group and 41% of the formal group. Similarly, 74% of the 1980 transfers entered with at least a 2.60 GPA compared to only 28% of the informal ISP transfers and 43% of the formal transfers (see table below). In addition, the Fall 1980 group includes students who never experienced academic difficulty at UCD, whereas all students in the other groups, except those selected from Summer STEP students who had not yet taken UCD courses, did poorly in at least one UCD course. Thus, the Fall 1980 comparison group would seem to have been at considerably less risk than any of the other groups.

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH ENTERING GPA OF AT LEAST 2.60

	Fall 1980	Fall 1981 non-ISP	Informal ISP	Formal ISP
High School	71%	53%	65%	41%
Transfer	74%	29%	28%	43%

2. We also cannot help believing that the degree to which the Fall 1981 non-ISP students represent a "contaminated" comparison group is understated. Many of these students changed their intended Winter or Spring Quarter course schedules as a result of the ISP early warning system. As you know, the early warning system distinguishes our reduced study load program from all others in the UC system and may very well be the most significant aspect of ISP. Because the early warning system impacts on the advising process, a critical factor in the retention of special

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—(Letterhead for interdepartmental use) Dean (7/82)

action students, the staff and I believe that any student who altered his/her schedule as a result of the system was, in fact, an ISP participant--particularly when one takes into account that only 22% of formal ISP participants reduced their study load below 10 units, with 52% reducing their study load by 1 unit at most. In other words, the difference between over half of the formal ISP participants and the Fall 1981 non-ISP comparison group is relatively slight. We, therefore, wonder whether the intensive advising given the Fall 1981 non-ISP group, all of whom had experienced some degree of academic difficulty, has received sufficient emphasis as it may account, in part, for that group's having experienced a 38% probationary rate compared to the 41% probationary rate experienced by the Fall 1980 group, many of whom had not experienced academic difficulty. This seems especially probable given the fact that 71% of the Fall 1980 freshmen entered with at least a 2.60 GPA compared to 53% of the Fall 1981 non-ISP freshmen, and 74% of the Fall 1980 transfers entered with at least a 2.60 GPA compared to only 29% of the Fall 1981 non-ISP transfers (see table above).

3. Although most formal ISP participants did fulfill their contracts, two did not and were subsequently denied the ISP minimum progress waiver by the College of Letters and Science. These students should thus not be included among the formal participants. Their exclusion would reduce the probationary rate for that group to 47%, rather than 50%. Overall, however, it would not alter the probationary rate for ISP participants, formal and informal, as a whole as shifting these to the informal group would raise that group's probationary rate from 50% to 54%. We, therefore, comment on these students only for the sake of accuracy.

4. While English 25 is not considered a remedial course and is therefore not included in your listing in Table 4, we would like to note that five formal ISP participants successfully completed that course.

B. Recommendations

1. We fully agree with recommendations one and three. We would like to suggest that the Office of Research and Information determine which data elements will be needed to assess the early warning system so that we can be sure to have the information available in a usable format.

2. While we agree that a better comparison group is needed, we cannot support recommendation two. To do so would, in our opinion, defeat the purpose and spirit of the program. The "Report of the UC Davis Task Force on Retention and Transfer" has already shown the likelihood of academic success for the population involved in the absence of additional intervention strategies. In light of the evidence provided in that report, we simply could not deny program services to any student with so little chance of succeeding on his/her own.

3. While implementing recommendation four might result in a higher "success" rate, it would also ignore the entire rationale for ISP--to reduce attrition among academically high-risk populations.

Finally, we would like to note our general sense of the difficulty, perhaps impossibility, of evaluating a program like ISP in the usual statistical way. By its very nature, ISP attempts to deal with each student as an individual. Very often, the reasons for a particular student's success or failure are indeed complex and go far beyond what a purely statistical approach can consider. As the students' responses to the ISP Telephone Survey indicate, their frustrations are many, their lack of self-confidence sometimes acute, and their need for support, both academic and non-academic, apparent. Because factors such as these had also been noted in the Task Force report, ISP was conceived as a multi-facted program involving not only academic skill building, but personal counseling, financial assistance, academic advising, timely intervention--in short, a range of needs, with the ultimate aim of increasing the retention rate of special action students over time. Ideally, we feel the program should be evaluated using a case history method. Such a method would not only be congruent with the program's concern for the individual student, it could also provide information useful both to program planning and to acquainting the campus community with the complex reality, rather than just the generally assumed academic inadequacy, responsible for the retention rate of special action students. Because we recognize that such a study is probably not feasible, we can only stress our agreement with recommendation three: "The long-term effect of the program should be assessed." We would, however, add that the assessment should determine whether or not the program has succeeded in its goal of increasing the retention rate of special action students over time.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the report.

VFM:ajs
cc: Yvonne Sanchez

Appendix A

INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM CONTRACT

The Individualized Study Program offers Special Action students an opportunity to take fewer than 12 units in a given quarter, while retaining the level of financial aid for which they have qualified. This opportunity is provided with the following stipulation: THE STUDENT MUST AGREE TO SPEND 9 HOURS (IF THE STUDENT IS TAKING 9 COURSE UNITS) OR 12 HOURS (IF THE STUDENT IS TAKING 8 COURSE UNITS) PER WEEK PURSUING AN INDIVIDUALIZED COURSE OF STUDY AND COUNSELING AT THE LEARNING SKILLS CENTER. MOREOVER, THE STUDENT IS REQUIRED TO FULLY PARTICIPATE IN HIS/HER PROGRAM EACH WEEK. FULL PARTICIPATION IS DEFINED AS AT LEAST 90% ATTENDANCE AT ALL ACTIVITIES AND CLEAR EVIDENCE OF EFFORT. FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE FULLY WILL RESULT IN THE STUDENT'S BEING DROPPED FROM THE PROGRAM. BECAUSE STUDENTS WHO ARE DROPPED FROM THE PROGRAM WILL NOT MEET THE MINIMUM PROGRESS REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR COLLEGE, THEY WILL ENDANGER THEIR ACADEMIC STANDING AT THE UNIVERSITY.

I agree to fully participate (at least 90% attendance and clear evidence of effort) in the Individualized Study Program outlined below during _____ Quarter 198 .

A. General Offerings

1. Study Skills Techniques--1 hour per week, plus an additional hour during weeks 2, 4, and 9

2. Group Orientation Sessions--1-1/2 hours per week, plus individual follow-up as needed

B. Special Topics Offerings

1.

2.

3.

TOTAL WEEKLY COMMITMENT -- HOURS

I understand that failure to follow-through on my agreement will result in my being dropped from the program and not meeting the minimum progress requirements of my college.

STUDENT SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____

EOP COUNSELOR SIGNATURE: _____

LSC COUNSELOR SIGNATURE: _____

Appendix B

INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM: DESCRIPTION OF OFFERINGS

A. General Offerings

1. Study Skills Techniques
   Counselors: Patricia Herthel and Maria Mitchum
   Time Commitment: 1 individual hour per week, plus 3 additional group sessions during weeks 2, 4, and 9
   Description: On an individual basis, students will learn to apply effective study techniques: time management, note-taking (lecture and text), listening, exam-taking (essay and objective), and memory strategies. Group sessions will cover the principles of time management (week 2), preparing for mid-term examinations (week 4), and preparing for final examinations (week 9).

2. Group Orientation Sessions
   Counselors: Gary Perkins, Naomi Sakai, Barbara Taylor
   Time Commitment: 1-1/2 hours per week, plus individual follow-up as needed
   Description: Groups will discuss the following topics: personal adjustment to campus life; forming a supportive network of peers; using student services; communicating with peers, faculty, and staff; and academic goal setting. Activities will include developing group dynamics, role-playing, video-taping, discussing interest surveys, assertiveness training, and interacting with guest speakers.

B. Special Topics Offerings

1. Mathematics Review
   Counselor: Ward Stewart
   Time Commitment: 3 hours per week
   Description: Under supervision, students will work individually in the Center's Learning Laboratory to learn or review mathematics concepts pre-requisite to the courses they either are enrolled in or intend to enroll in. For example, Math B students will have the opportunity to review decimals, percentages, proportions, and geometry; Math D students will have the opportunity to review functions and basic algebra, as well as gain additional practice in problem-solving for advanced algebra; opportunities to review trigonometry and gain additional practice in solving statistics problems will also be available. Students will take periodic examinations to ensure that they have mastered material and will meet weekly with LSC's Math Coordinator to review their progress.

2. Pre-Chemistry Workshop
   Counselor: Patricia Herthel
   Time Commitment: 2 hours per week
   Description: Students who intend to enroll in Chemistry 1A during their first year will attend a weekly group lecture/discussion of basic principles of chemistry. They will spend an additional hour of supervised problem-solving each week. Both a mid-term and a final examination will be given to determine the student's readiness for Chemistry 1A. If necessary, individual conferences will also be arranged.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Writing Skills
   Counselors: Joan Rothstein and Barbara Gunn
   Time Commitment: 4 to 6 hours per week
   Description: Students will participate in supervised, structured writing practice and revision sessions, as well as receive comments on their performance and meet individually with a writing specialist each week (a total of 4 hours). In addition, students who lack knowledge of basic grammar will spend 1 to 2 hours each week, depending upon their need, doing self-paced exercises in the Center's Learning Laboratory.

4. Reading Strategies
   Counselor: Caroline Turner
   Time Commitment: 3 hours per week
   Description: Both on an individual basis and in groups, students will learn strategies necessary to reading college textbooks effectively. Pre-reading techniques, comprehension skills, and ways to improve retention will be stressed. In addition, students will learn how to identify elements of course organization in order to increase study-reading effectiveness. Vocabulary improvement and rate-building exercises will be assigned as necessary.

5. Vocabulary Development
   Counselor: Catherine Freund
   Time Commitment: 2 hours per week
   Description: Students will learn words most commonly used in academic discourse. They will also learn methods for increasing vocabulary, such as identifying meaning through the use of context clues, affixes, and roots. Correct use of prepositions will be stressed for students whose primary language is not English.

6. Language Skills
   Counselor: Mary Lowry
   Time Commitment: 1 to 3 hours per week
   Description: Students will read under supervision, primarily at their instructional level, in order to develop fluency in understanding written materials, to increase vocabulary and to learn strategies for approaching readings at various levels of difficulty. Students whose first language is not English will also receive instruction in grammar, listening comprehension, and pronunciation as needed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C

_____
Name of student

SURVEY OF INDIVIDUALIZED
STUDY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
MAY 1982

HELLO, IS _____ THERE?

If person is not available, inquire:

DO YOU KNOW WHERE/WHEN I CAN REACH HIM/HER?

If person answering is reluctant to give information, tell them:

MY NAME IS _____.
I'M CALLING FROM THE UCD OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS. WE'RE CONDUCTING A SURVEY OF PEOPLE WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM AT UC DAVIS. DO YOU KNOW WHERE I CAN REACH _____?

Mark response on telephone log.

Terminate call.

(If the person has been called five times with no success, terminate efforts to reach them, and mark the log.)

If person is available:

MY NAME IS _____ AND I'M CALLING FROM THE OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS AT UCD. WE'RE DOING A SURVEY OF STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM AT UCD. WE'D LIKE TO ASK STUDENTS HOW THEY'RE DOING AND WHAT THEY THINK OF THE INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM.

If they did participate:

I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU FOR YOUR REACTIONS TO UCD AND TO THE INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM YOU WERE IN. THE QUESTIONS WILL TAKE ABOUT _____ MINUTES. YOU DON'T HAVE TO ANSWER ANY OR ALL OF THESE QUESTIONS BUT, IF YOU DO, YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE CONFIDENTIAL. YOU'RE FREE TO HANG UP THE PHONE AT ANY TIME DURING THE INTERVIEW IF YOU WANT TO. WHETHER OR NOT YOU PARTICIPATE WILL NOT AFFECT YOUR FUTURE RELATIONS WITH THE UNIVERSITY. WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE?

If not, terminate call with thanks and mark log.

If yes, continue on to the next page.

1. I'M GOING TO READ SEVERAL STATEMENTS THAT REFLECT THE GOALS OF MANY COLLEGE STUDENTS. CAN YOU TELL ME HOW IMPORTANT THESE GOALS ARE TO YOU PERSONALLY? (use the following scale)

NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	(0)
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	(1)
DEFINITELY IMPORTANT	(2)
ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT	(3)

_____ TO INCREASE MY KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING IN AN ACADEMIC FIELD

_____ TO OBTAIN A DEGREE

_____ TO COMPLETE COURSES NECESSARY TO TRANSFER TO ANOTHER INSTITUTION OR TO GO TO GRADUATE SCHOOL

_____ TO DISCOVER CAREER INTERESTS

_____ TO FORMULATE LONG-TERM CAREER PLANS AND/OR GOALS

_____ TO PREPARE FOR A CAREER

_____ TO BECOME ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN STUDENT LIFE AND CAMPUS ACTIVITIES

_____ TO INCREASE MY PARTICIPATION IN CULTURAL AND SOCIAL EVENTS

_____ TO MEET PEOPLE

_____ TO INCREASE MY SELF-CONFIDENCE

_____ TO IMPROVE MY LEADERSHIP SKILLS

_____ TO DEVELOP MY ABILITY TO BE INDEPENDENT, SELF-RELIANT AND ADAPTABLE

2. CAN YOU THINK OF ANY OTHER GOALS THAT YOU HAVE SET FOR YOUR COLLEGE EDUCATION THAT WEREN'T INCLUDED IN THE LIST I JUST READ?

3. I'D LIKE TO KNOW YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE VALUE OF THE INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM. WHAT DID YOU GAIN FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM?

4. WHAT, IF ANYTHING, DIDN'T YOU GAIN THAT YOU FEEL YOU SHOULD HAVE?

5. WHAT WERE/ARE THE MOST DIFFICULT PROBLEMS THAT YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED SINCE BEING AT UCD?

6. WHAT WERE THE BIGGEST PROBLEMS YOU FEEL YOU HAD TO RESOLVE BEFORE COMING TO UCD?

7. WERE YOU EMPLOYED DURING THE LAST TWO QUARTERS? _____Yes _____No
HOW MANY HOURS A WEEK DID YOU WORK? _____

8. OVERALL, DO YOU THINK THAT YOU HAVE ACHIEVED ANY OF YOUR GOALS SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN AT UCD? _____Yes _____No

9. IF YOU HAD NOT PARTICIPATED IN THE INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM, DO YOU THINK YOUR LAST TWO QUARTERS AT UCD WOULD HAVE BEEN MUCH DIFFERENT?